o Sinvery in Mebraska-No Slavery in t Slavery an Cutlaw.

## SPEECH OF GERRIT SMITH THE NEBRASKA BILL

[ Mr. Gerrit Smith having been under the im pression that several journals, and THE TPIBUNE among the number, had cast imputations upon his integrity as an opponent of Slavery, has called apon us to give place in our advertising columns, and in all the editions of THE TRIBUNE, to his speech delivered in the House of Representatives against the Nebraska bill, in order that the public may know what his position really is on that subject. At the same time, as a compensation for this service, he has forwarded to us the sum of five hundred dollars. Though we have done Mr. Smith ne such injustice as he supposes, and though the five hundred dollars is barely sufficient to pay the cost of the blank paper required to print so enormous a number of copies of such a document, we have not felt at liberty to refuse the demand of a gentleman of Mr. Smith's character and public services. We regret to be obliged to print the greater part of the speech in type so small, but its exceeding length leaves us no option .- Ed. Trib.

So, Mr. Chairman, the Slavery question is up again! up again, even in Congress!! It will not keep down. At no bidding, however authoritative, will it keep down. The President of the United States commands it to keep down. Indeed, he has hitherto seemed to make the keeping down of this question the great end of his great office. Members of Congress have so far bumbled themselves as to pledge themselves on this floor to keep it down. National political conventions promise to discountenance and even to resist the agi-tation of Slavery both in and out of Congress. Com-merce and politics are as afraid of this agitation as Macbeth was of the ghost of Banquo; and many titled divines, taking their cue from commerce and politics, and being no less servile than merchants and magogues, do what they can to keep the Slavery question out of sight. But all is of no avail. The saucy Slavery question will not mind them. To repress one-quarter, is only to have it burst forth more prominently in another quarter. If you hold it back here, it will break loose there, and rush forward with an accumulated force, that shall amply revenge for all its detention. And this is not strange, when we consider how great is the power of truth. It were madness for man to bid the grass not grow, the waters not to run, the winds not to blow. It were madness for him to assume the mastery of the elements of the physical world. But more emphatically were it mad-ness for him to attempt to hold in his puny fist the forces of the moral world. Canute's folly, in setting bounds to the sea, was wisdom itself, compared with the so much greater folly of attempting to subjugate the moral forces. Now, the power which is ever and anon throwing up the Slavery question into our unwilling and affrighted faces, is truth. The passion-blinded and the infatuated may not discern this mighty agent. Nevertheless, truth lives and reigns forever; and she will be, continually, toss ing up unsettled questions. We must bear in too, that every question which has not been disposed of in conformity with her requirements, and which has not been laid to repose on her own and which has not been laid to repose on her own blessed bosom, is an unsettled question. Hence Slavery is an unsettled question, and must continue such, until it shall have fled forever from the pre-sence of liberty. It must be an entirely unsettled question, because, not only is it not in harmony with truth, but there is not one particle of truth in it. Sla-very is the baldest and biggest hie on earth. In redu-

very is the baldest and biggest tie on earth. In reduing man to a chattel it denies that man is man; and,
in denying that man is man, it denies that God is God
—for, in His own image made He man—the black man
the white man. Distorted
in the chite man, Distorted
in the control of the special control of the varieties of the human family may not be apparent
to us all. Were we delivered from this prejudice, and
this spirit, much of the darkness which now obsurce
our vision would be scattered. In proportion as we
obey the truth are we able to discern the truth. And
if all that is wrong within us were made right, not only
would our darkness give place to a cloudless light, but,
like the angel of the Apocalypse, we should stand in
the sun.

But to my argument. I am opposed to the bill for organizing the Territories of Nebraska and Kansas, which has come to us from the Senate, because, in the first place, it insults colored men, and the Maker of all men, by limiting suffrage to white men. I am opposed to it because, in the second place, it limits satisfies the second place, it limits satisfies the second place, it is satisfied to the second place and the second place are second place. persons who have acquired citizenship. man who comes to us from a foreign land, and de-clares his intention to make his home among us, and acts in harmony with such declaration, is well entitled to vote with us. He has given one great evidence of

to vote with us. He has given one great evidence of possessing an American heart which our native could not give. For, while our native became an American by the accident of birth, the emigrant became one from choice. For while our native may be an American, not from any preference for America, the emigrant has proved that he prefers our country to every other.

I am opposed to the bill, in the third place, because it is so drawn as to convey the deceptive idea (I do not say intentionally deceptive) that the bill recognizes the doctrine of non-intervention. I call it deceptive idea; for in point of fact the bill does not recognize the doctrine of non-intervention. It dictates to the Territories the form of their Government, and denies to them the appointing of their principal and denies to them the appointing of their principal officers. The bill is itself, therefore, the most emphatic omeers. The bit is itself, therefore, the most emphasize intervention. One hundreth as much intervention on the part of the Federal Government with a State Government would be condemned as outrageous and intelested intervention.

But I must be frank and admit that if the bill did real-

But I must be frank and admit that if the bill did really recognize the doctrine of non-intervention I should still be opposed to it—ay, and for that very reason. This whole doctrine of Congressional non-intervention with our Territories I regard as perfectly absurd. Congressional intervention with them is an importative and unavoidable duty. The reasoning to this end is simple and irresistible. The people of the United States acquire a Territory. Being theirs, they are re-providing for its conduct and character, and being specific the conduct and character. simple and irresistible. The people of the United States acquire a Territory. Being theirs, they are responsible for its conduct and character; and being thus responsible they not only have the right, but are absolutely, bound to govern the Territory. So long as the Territory is theirs, they can no more abdicate sovereignty over one of its counties. But the people of the United States govern through Congress: and, hence, in respect to what is the people's, there must be Congressional intervention. In the nature of the case this must be so. But the Constitution also shows that it must be so. But the Constitution also shows that it must be so. The Constitution declares the fact of the government of the nation by itself; and it also recognizes the fact of the government of a State by itself; but nowhere does it so much as hint at the government of a Territories to Congress, or, in other words, to the whole people of the United States.

I add, incidentally, that in the light of the fact of the American people's responsibility for the conduct and character of their Territories, it is a search to claim that New-Mexico and Utah are to be exempt from Savery because the Mexican Government had aboisibed Slavery. Whether there can be legal Slavery in those Territories turns solely on the character of the Constitution—turns solely on the question whether that generic is Anti-Slavery or Pro-Slavery Again, in the

of the one and the decisions of the other must be but applications and interpretations of this one organic law.

Another incidental remark is, that it is wrong to charge the opposents of this bill with denying and dishonoring the doctrine of "popular savereignty." Holding, as we do, that to the people—the whole people—of the United States belong both the lands and the sovereignty of their territories, we insist that to shut them out from governing their territories, would be to deny and dishonor the doctrine of "popular save-"reignty." It is the friends of the hill who, provided it is, as they claim, a bill for non-intervention, that are to be charged with violating the doctrine of "popular "sovereignty," and the principles and genius of Democracy. I close, under this head, with saying that, should real non-intervention obtain in regard to these territories, it would be a very great and very astonishing effange from our present policy. The lubabitants of a territory have no vote in Cougress. Nevertheless, real ron-intervention would vest them with the exclusive disposal of imperiant affairs, which are now at the exclusive disposal of Congress. It would compensate them for their present political disabilities with as amount of political power greatly exceeding that enjoyed by an equal handfull of the people of a State.

To prevent misapprehension of my views, I add, that I am not opposed to making inhabitants of the Territory officers of the Territory. So far as practicable, I would have none other for its officers. But, while the Territory is the nation's, all its officers should be acknowledged to be officers and servants of the nation.

I proceed to say that I am opposed to this bill in the of the one and the decisions of the other must be but

proceed to say that I am opposed to this bill in the fourth place, because it looks to the existence of Slavery in these Territories, and provides safeguards fourth place, because it looks to the existence of Slavery in these Territories, and provides safeguards for it. In other words, Congress does, by the terms of the bill, open the door for Slavery to enter these Territories. The right of Congress to do so I dealy. I deny it bowever not because the compronise of 1820 denies it. Believing that compromise to be invalid, I cannot honestly claim anything under it. I discisim all rights under it, for the simple reason that a compromise cenceived in sin and brought forth in iniquity can impart no rights—for the simple reason that a compromise which annihilated rights cannot create rights. I admit that the compromise of 1820 concedes the indestructibleness of manhood north of the line of 36° 30', excepting in Missouri. But, on the other hand, it atones for this concession to trath and justice by implicitly leaving men routh of that line and in Missouri to be classed with brutes and things. I admit, too, that they who are enjoying the shere of slavery under this compromise, and who, now, that freedom was about to enter into the enjoyment of her share under it—I admit, I say, that they are estopped from joining me in prorouncing the Missouri Compromise invalid. They must first make restitution to Freedom—ere they can, with clean hands and amblushing faces, ask her to forego the enjoyment of her share. "But this "condition is impracticable!" will some of my hearers say. Oh, no! nothing is impracticable that is right. Exclude Slavery from Missouri and Arkansss for thirty-four years, and then Freedom and Slavery will be on an equal footing, and they can make a new barka'n [Laughter].

Nor do I deny the right of Congress to open the

thirty-four years, and then Freedom and Slavery will be on an equal feeting, and they can make a new bargain [Laughter].

Nor do I deep the right of Congress to open the door for Slavery into these Territories, because the Compromise of 1850 virtually denies it. I say that Compromise virtually denies it, because it distinctly and approvingly recognizes the Compromise of 1820. The Compromise of 1850 is as rotten as the Compromise of 1820, and as incapable of imparting rights. And here let me say, that I rejoice to see the Pro-Slavery party pouring express contempt on the Compromise of 1820, and virtual contempt on the Compromise of 1820. And why should not all men pour contempt upon these Compromises, and upon all other compromises which aim "to split the difference" between God and the devil? [Great laughter.] By the way, we have strising proof, in the instance of this bill, that in the case of such compromises, God's share and all are, in the end, very like to be claimed for the devil. [Renewed laughter.].

I have said on what grounds it is not that I deny the right of Congress to open the door for Slavery into these Territories. I will now say on what ground it is. I deny it on the ground that the Constitution, the only law of the Territories, is not in favor of Slavery, and that Slavery cannot be set up unifer it. If there cannot be in the Territories.

In the fifth and last place, I am opposed to the bill

cannot be in the Territories.

In the fifth and last place, I am opposed to the bill because it allows that there may be Slavery in the States which shall be formed from these Territories.

because it allows that there may be Slavery in the States which shall be formed from these Territories.

Hitherto, when the Slavery question has been brought up in Congress, it has been alleged (I say not how truly or untruly) that the Anti-Slavery party has brought it up, and for the purpose of checking Slavery. But now it is confessedly on all hands brought up by the Pro-Slavery party, and for the purpose of extending Slavery. In this instance the Pro-Slavery party is manifestly the instrument which truth has wielded to subserve her purpose of reawakening the public mind to the demands and enormities of Slavery. Most sincerely do I redice that the Pro-Slavery party is responsible for the present agitation.

A Member—I do not admit that it is

Mr. Smith.—Strange! Here is a movement for the immense extension of Slavery. Of course, it is not the work of the Anti-Slavery party. And if the honorable member, who has just interrupted me, is authorized to speak for the Pro-Slavery party, it is not the work of that party either. I took it for granted, that the Pro-Slavery party did it. But, it seems it did not. It puts on the innocent air of a Macbeth, and looks me in the face and exclaims: "Thou caust not say I did it!" [Laughter.] Well, if neither the Anti-Slavery party nor the Pro-Slavery party did it, who was it, then, that did it! It follows, necessarily, that it must be the work of the Lord, or the devil. [Laughter.] But, it cannot be the work of the Lord—for the good book tells us: "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty—liberty, not Slavery. So, this Nebraska business must be the work of the devil. [Great laughter.] But logical as is this conclusion, I am. nevertheless, too polite to press it. I prefer laughter.] But logical as is this conclusion, I am, nevertheless, too polite to press it. I prefer to repudinte the alternative, that puts the responsibility os the Lord or the devit; and to return to my original assertion, that the Pro-Slavery party, and not Anti-Slavery party, is responsible for the present agitation. Do not understand that I would not have the Anti-Slavery party agitate. I would have it agitate, and agitate, and agitate forever. I believe, that the agitation of the elements of the moral world is as essential to moral health, as is the agitation of the elements of the physical world to physical health. I believe in the beautiful motto: "The agitation of thought is the beginning of truth." I was very happy to hear the honorable gentleman of Pennsylvania (Mr. Wright) express his faith and pleasure in agitation. Not less happy was I to hear the honorable gentleman of North Carolina (Mr. Clingman) approve of the discussion of Slavery. Such good abolition doctrine from such surprising sources was very gratifying to me. Perhaps these gentlemen will continue to move forward in that blessed upward way, on which they have happily entered; and, perhaps, ere the session shall close, they will have reached that table-land of abolition, on which it is my privilege to stanc. Let me assure them, for the purpose of cheering them onward, that when they shall arrive there they shall not lack my warm greetings and the cordial grasp of my hand (Great laughter). Sir, you must permit me to indulge some hope of the conversion of these gentlemen. Indeed, when I heard the honorable gentlemen or North Carolina speak of himself as "an independent"—as a party of one—as in that lone condition, in which he had so recently heard me say that I find myself—was I not at liberty to imagine that he was throwing out a sly, delicate hint to my ear, that he would like to "join teams" with me, and so make up a party of two! [Repeated roars of laughter.] I do not forget that at the close of his speech he said some very hard things a am, nevertheless, too police to press it. I prefer to repudinte the alternative, that puts the respon-

I said a little while ago that I rejoice that the Pro-I said a little while ago that I rejoice that the Pro-Slavery party is responsible for the present agitation. I add that I am half reconciled to this attempt to ex-tend the dominion of Slavery, because it affords us so inviting an opportunity to inquire into the title of Slavery. If my neighbor tries to rob me of my farm, be at least affords me an occasion for inquiring into the tenure by which be holds his own farm. Freedom having been driven by Slavery until she has surrendered to ber pursuer time new States—and until Slavery claims, as we see in the present bill, equal right with herself to overstrend all the uncoranized territory of the as we see in the present bill, equal right with herself to overspread all the unorganized territory of the nation—it is, in my judgment, high time for her to stop, and to turn about and to look Slavery in the face, and to push back the war—aye, and to drive the aggressor to the wall provided she at all find that Slavery in all its progress and history is nothing but an aggression on liberty and law and on humsal and divine rights, and that in truth it has no three to any existence whatever, on any terms witnever, anywhere whatever. This is a proper stage of my argument for saying that we all knew enough of freedom and slavely to know, that they cannot live together permanently. One must conquer the other. American blavery lacks but wo things to make sure of her victory over American liberty; and from present indications, she is determined to lack them no longer. One of these two things is the conceded right to overspread all our unorganised territory, and the other is its conceded right to carry slaves through the fire States. Let Slavery succeed in these two respects:—let the bill we are now considering become a statute; and let the final decident in the Lemmon case \* seatan the claim to carry slaves through the fire States—ay, and even to drive office of slaves. abolished Slavery. Whether there can be legal Slavery in those Territories turns solely on the character of the Co-stitution—turns solely on the question whether that paper is Anti-Slavery or Pro-Slavery. Again, in the light of this same fact, we see how absurd it is to claim that there could, under the continued force of the French or Spanish laws, be Slavery in the Territory of Louisian after we had acquired it. If after such acquiristion there was or could be legal Slavery in the Territory, it was solely because the Constitution—the only law which then attached to the Territory, authorized it. What, if when we had acquired the Territory, there had been in it, among the creatures of French, or Spanish, or other law, the entire, or cannibalism—would it not have been held that these abominations were repugnant to the Constitution, and therefore without legal existence? Certainly.

I spoke of the Constitution as the only law which attaches to our Territoriex. I was justified in this, because it is the only law of the people of the United States, when they are taken as a whole or a unit. When regarded in sections, the have other laws also. The people of a State have the laws of their nation. But I repeat it, the people of the United States, when via wed as one, have no other law than the Constitution. Their Congress and Judiciary can know no ether law. The statutes

through them whip in hand; thus breaking dow at the public sentiment of those States against Savery, and showshing and writing it by familiarizing it with the demand and exhibitions of Slavery;—and then, I admit, the way will be decided and provide and partial sear learners of Slavery to make aquick and say acquired a learner.

I again acknowledge my partial sear learners to this strempt of Slavery to get more partial sear learners to this strempt of Slavery to get more partial sear learners. The have more than the search of Slavery thall come of as badly as the dog who in opening his month to reich arother piece of meet host is the deceiving and shadow learners are the piece, he sirectly had. It will have no one to blame for its folly but, its owns voncious seaf. It should have been content with the big share—the lionic share—which it already had.

But to ceturn from the diagression. I said, that I am opposed to the ball her case it silows that there may be Slavery in the States, which shall be formed from these territories. Why, however, should be forefore, opposed to in! I will without dealty come to the reason for my opposition. The protons because of blank-intending, But I will at once take the company of the state of the said state that the protons because of shader missing. But I will at once take the formed within these territories, because I leng that there can be Constitutional Slavery in any of the State of the American Urson—fature States of present State—new or old. I had that there is no law for American Slavery.

I had not the donester's and declare that I deay the right of Congress to low the blank intended to the said state of the state of the American Slavery.

I had not the constitution on only an horize on Slavery but permitten Slavery in only treater no Slavery in the States that their way to the land, but adorders Slavery in the States that their way to the land, but adorders Slavery in the States that their way to the land, but and the said that there is no law for American Urson had the

equal right to use what is respectively them. To limitate is meaning at this point: if I am born with but one foot, and one ye, and an organization capable of receiving but one clear, it have a right to use my one foot, and one eye, and one deed, equal with the right of my neighbor to use ulst two feet, and two eyes, and two thousand ideas.

The samedation of this great center truth of the Declaration of Independence would have manifed every American slave, at the time of that camedation, in claiming his liberty. Suppose that after the adoption of the Declaration of Independence an American periot had been some by a british force, and put on true for re-bellion spatint the Kinz, would not that paper have justified him in calling on his countrymen to decive him Certain y for that paper asserts the right to break away from his allegiance to the King, and plades the "lives, fortness, and secret "he non" of his countrymen to maintain that right. But suppose that after the adoption of the Declaration of independence as American sieve had asserted his right to liverty, might he not, as well as the patrior referred to, have called on his countrymen to acknowledge and defend his right? Certainly; and a thousand-fold more on photically. For the right of the patriot to dissolve his allegiance to the Crown is but a deduction from the great center truth of the paper that all men are created causal, and have insulentally rights. But the title of the slave to his liberty; the great center truth left? The title of the larve his liberty at he great center truth seef? The title of the larve to his liberty at he great center truth seef? The title of the larve in his liberty at he great center truth seef? The title of the larve to his liberty at he great center truth seef? The title of the larve to his liberty at he great center truth seef. country and inalterable right to liberty is east led to supremsely in all the shaping and interpretation of American politics that, but for it and for the place it accupies in the Declaration of Independence, there would have been no American institution and no American institution and no American institution and no American institution and no American institution that the confuse could not have been accused to their glorious ablevament. It was in his rights to the commanding principle and mighty inspiration, the aid—the indispensable aid—that came to us from foreign shores would not have come. Said La Fayette to Themas Clarkson: I would never have drawn my sword in the cause of America if I could have comediated that thereby I was founding a land of slavery." And there was Kocciosano, at whose fall "Freedom shielesd," and who provided by the will, written by himself, that his property in An errica should be used by his Aut Slavery friend, Thomas Jefferson, in liberating and educating African saves. Surely haveful not, with his eyes open, have fought to create a power that should be wielded in beand of African Slavery. On how could and nean a fraud on those who fought for American Iberty for establishing and extending American Slavery.

would not, with his eyes open, have fought to create a power that should be weighed in benial of African Islavery! On how could and mean a fraud on those who fought for American Islavery!

But we pass on from the Declaration of Independence to the Federal Constitution, and suppose, for the sake of the argument, that Slavery survived the Declaration of Independence. New, our first question is out what is the character of the Constitution in respect to Slavery, but what from the circumstances of the case we might reasonably expect to find its character in this respect, its reasonably expected character may be thought by many to shed light upon its actual character. Looking at the circumstances of the case are we to expect to find the Constitution Pro-Slavery or Anti-Slavery!—made to uphold Slavery, or to leave at an unprotected cutaw?

It is argued that it Constitution must be on the side of Slavery for the reason that it did not specifically demand the instant death of Slavery. Those is, however, no force in this argument if we reflect that American Slavery was at that time a dying Slavery; and that, therefore, even this of our statemen, who were most opposed to it were gonerally willing to leave it to die a natural set in, rather than to farce it out of existence. Were a man condemned to be hung, nevertheless, if, when the exp for harging bim had arrived, he were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging bim had arrived, he were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging bim had arrived, he were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging bim had arrived, be were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging bim had arrived, be were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging bim had arrived, be were on his death-bed, you wen'd not harging the he log continuous of Slavery is manifest from their ye pose disclosed in the Frambs of the Constitution and elewhere, to set up a government which should maintain justice and thereto, that has been dead to have constituted the size had been dead to have constituted the size had been dead to Now the shareholder is the saint and the abolitionist the single to. To liberrate in still another way, the abstraity of interring my at shareholders desired and did skry or seventy wars are, from what they desire and do now the pocuniary motive of the save bediet to uphold Slavery is now very strong. Then, it was very a wak. American cane-unsar, now wet with the tears, and were at and blood of even of thousands of slaves, was then sentency thown. American content, which now file the markets of the weight, which is well as the markets of the weight, which we have the more of the markets of the world. Then it was not among the interests of our country. Now, it is its dominant interest. It ways Church and State and commerce, and our pries all of them to go for Slavery. Then the price of the sia v, that now sells for a thousand or inferen hundred dollars, was let two bundred dollars.

I need say to mo, to show how liable we are to misinterpret

portions a clause. There is, however, no reterence out here, if the Louige is intepreted according to its legal sense, or if the framers of the Goestinution were intelligent and honer. It must be remarked, that it was from this clause that they strick out the word "servitude." for the avowed purpose of saving it from being a Pro-Slavery clause. But, in point of fact, if this clause does not refer to Slavery, it is novembered a clause not to encourage but to discourage Slavery. The clause dischibition of a strict in the National Connells in proportion to the extent of it Slavery. This clause is in truth a hounty on emancipation. Had it provided that drukards should each count but three-fifths of a man, it surely would not be called a clause to encourage dimensions. Or, had it provided that they who can neither read not write should each count but three-fifths of a man, it surely would be a bounty on sobriety, and in the other on education.

The next clause of the Constitution which we will examine is that which confessedly empowers Congress to explicate commerce with foreign nations. Yes, the Slave States confessed ye oneed to Congress the amover of abolish the trade, and Congress did actually abolish it. But it is said that the provision respecting "algration or importation" sespended the exercise of this power for twenty years. Under no legal stui proper sense of it, however, does this provision refer to elseva. Eur, for the sake of the signament, we will admit that it does, and that it had the effect to suspend for twenty years.

refer to slaves. But, for the sake of the argument, we will admit that it does, and that it had the effect to suspend for twenty years the exercise of the power in question. What then? The suspension could not destroy, nor to any degree impair, the essential Anti Slavery character of the clause under consideration. On the contrary, the suspension itself shows that the clause was regarded by the makers of the Constitution as potentially. Anti-Slavery—as one that was capable of being wielded, and that probably would be wielded, to suppress the slavetrade. I would add, that this brief suspension goes to justify the position that American Slavery was stocked upon in that day as a rapidly-expiring practice—as a vice that would die cut in a few wears. There is much historical evidence that the abolithon of the slave-trade was looked to by many, if not tudeed by more, at that time, either as equivalent to, or as sure to re-

justify the position that American Slavery was looked upon in that day as a rapidly-appling practice—as a vice that would diocut in a few years. There is much listorical evidence that the abolition of the slave-trade was looked to by many, if not indeed by most, at that time, either as equivalent to, or as sure to result in, the abolition of Slavery. The power given to Congress to abolish the slave-trade, Mr. Dawas, in the Massachusetts Convention that adopted the Constitution, declared to be "the "nortal wound" of Slavery.

Manifessiy the clause of the Constitution which imparts power to abelish the slave trade, and not that which briefly suspends the exercise of this power, gives character to the Constitution. If my neighbor decade are bis farm, only reserving to himself the power-sion of it for a month (and a week in the life of an individual is longer than twenty years in the dife of a nation), it was the citation by every absurd to call it a transaction for continuing him in the owner-lip and possession of the farm. Or if the bargain which it make with my neighbor is that atter a week's delay be shall come into my service for life, it is cortainly not this little celay that is to stamp the essential and important character of the bargain.

I have referred to only a pan of the clause which gives power to Congress to abolish the slave-trade; to only that part which respects the foreign slave-trade. I now add that this clause gives equal power to abolish the lower-trade; to only that part which respects the foreign slave-trade. I now add that this clause gives equal power to abolish the one-trade give equal power to abolish the say that a Constitution which empt were equal power to abolish the lower-trade give equal power to abolish the say that a Constitution which empt were equal power to abolish the say that a constitution which empt were except States" in act a power to abolish the above trade. The barriers are present and the trade of the say that the fact and the constitution which empty were proved to

turalization."
But this power, if faithfully exercised, is fatal to Slavery.

as unalization, which the Constitution confers on Congress.

4. "The Congress shall have power to promote the progress of science and useful orth by securing for limited times to authors and insentors the exclusive right to their respective writing, and discoveries."

This clause clearly sutherizes Congress to encourage and reward the gains, as well of him who is called a slave, as of any other person. One person as much as another is entitled to a capyright of his book and to a patent for his meritorious invention. Not so bowever, if there may be Slavery. For the vicining of six ery has no rights; and the productions of his mind, ro less than the productions of his hands, belong to his master.

5. "Congress shall have power to declare wor, grant letters of marque and reprisol—to raise and support armise—to provide and maining a nay."

It is accessarily follows, from the unconditional power of Congress to carry on war, that it can contract with whom it pleases—white or black, employer or employed—to fight its battles; and can secure to each his wages, pension, or prize money. But utterly he maistent with this absolute power of Congress is the claim of the slaveholder to the time, the estimate, the will, the all, of the salue, or solidler, whom he calls his airce.

6. "The United States shall governate to every state in this Union or republican form of government."

It is a common opinin in that the General Government should not concern itself with the internal policy and arrangements of a State. But this opinion is not justified by the Constitution. The case may occur where the neglect thus to concern itself well distress to the people of a State. How could the General Government be maintained if in one State suffrage were universal and in mother on the possession of all nother on the possession of all nother on the possession of all nother on the possession of all serious possession of a prescribed religious creed, and is another on the possession of a prescribed religious creed, and in another conditioned on

B. The principle of cases of rebellion or incusion, the public soficy may require it?

Blackrouse protononces this writ? the most celebrated writ of "Freland and the chief bulwark of the Constitution." One of his editors, Mr. Christian, says that it "is this writ which "makes Slavery impossible in England." Equally impossible, in theory, does it make Slavery in America. And in both countries the impossibility springs from the fact that the writ is entirely incompetible with the claim of property in man. In the presence of such a claim, it valid, this writ is imporent; for if property can plead in the prisoner (and possession is proof of ownership) the writ is defeated.

Slavery cannot be legalized short of suspending the writ of habras corpus in the case of the slaves. But insamn h as the Constitution provides for no such suspension, there is no logal Slavery in the nation.

Slavery in the nation.

I add that the Federal Government should see to it that in

I sed that the reserve where there are staves, if need be, in every part of the nation where there are staves, if need be, in every county, or even town, there are judges who will faithfully use this writ for their deliverance.

1 "No person shall be deprited of life, liberty, or property,

ne time vin constant be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of low."

Let this provision have free course, and it puts an end to American Slavery. It is claimed, however, that inamuch as the sixet is held by law (which in point of fact he is not), and therefore "by due process of isw," nothing can be gained for bim from this provision. But inasmuch as this provision is an organic and fundamental law, it is not subject to any other law, but is paramount to every other law. Moreover, it is a great mistake to confrond the laws so called by which persons are held in slavery with "due process of law."

Justice Brusson says (Hull's Reports, IV, 146) of this part of the Constitution:

"The meaning of the section then seems to be, that no member of the State shall be distranchised or deprived of any of his rights or privileges, unless the matter shall be adjudged against

necessary to provide spains? the other, and was satisfied would be equally grateful to the people.

The House of Representatives did not adopt Mr. Mare plan of distributing the embeddeness through the order situation, and thus expressly applying one to the Federa another to a State Government. On the contrary, a them a supplement to the original Constitution, an idea of them couched in terms that render them equally specified to one Government or the other. It must not be ten that Mr. Madinor's plan was embodied in a reported mittre, and was kept outfore the cloues for a long its must it be forgotten that whatever may have been safely or that speaker, in respect to the application of the amendments apply to the General Government, before the amendments apply to the General Government, become a still more memorable is, that there was taken, which shows that the House oid not mean to have the amendments apply to the General Government easy, were wear an the following proposed amendment: 'Spr' "still be subject in case of impreachment, to more desirable to the amendments apply to the General Government easy, were the companied of the subject in case of impreachment, to more desirable to the subject in case of impreachment, to more desirable to the subject in case of impreachment, to more desirable of Massachusetts meved to insert after "amendate to the proposed of the subject in the subject in the two ors." By any law of the United States. 'Harded; and its issuer proved that the House would mad State as with a take nation from such oppression.

As the Seante sat with closed doors we know that its proceeding in respect to the amendments, exception of the subject would be those of more mental and the counter after the counter and the proceeding in respect to the amendments, exception.

amendments of the Contention are used in the trace in and if anywhere they conflict with it the Contential Thave now done not only with the amendments but we are Constitution. Within the compass of a single sould, of course, comprise but an outline of my against commend to my hearers the arguments of William Gost Lyanuder Sponer on this subject. It must be very discussion to the content of the Lyanuder Sponer on this subject. It must be very discussion to rise from the candid reading. Sponer's book, entitled "The Unconstitution that of the large convinced by its unsurpassed legic that are Slavery finds no protection in the Constitution.

I said that I have now done with the Constitution.

I said that I have now done with the Constitution. Its I mean warranted in adding that I have reached the continuing the manifest logical necessity for arriving at it, is a law not sound? One of the objections to its sound that the slaveholders could never have consented to Constitution of such Anti-Slavery powers—I have also plied to by saying that the slaveholders of that day, semipled to be a fair. To this I add, that wherever were the to of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the former of that day, and whatever were their movines and my and a statistical content of the advention of the advention of the of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the bodiers of that day, and whatever were their movines and and the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the bodiers of that day, and whatever were their movines and the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the production of the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the contents of the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the contents of the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the contents of the state of the later. To this I add, that wherever were the contents of the state of the later.

constitution to hold back remarkation of these crimes.

Ty person remembers the part of the tenth amount o